arXiv:0707.0077v1 [math.CA] 30 Jun 2007

FINITE SECTIONS OF WEIGHTED CARLEMAN'S INEQUALITY

PENG GAO

Abstract. We study finite sections of weighted Carleman's inequality following the approach of De Bruijn. Similar to the unweighted case, we obtain an asymptotic expression for the optimal constant.

1. Introduction

The well-known Carleman's inequality asserts that for convergent infinite series $\sum a_n$ with non-negative terms, one has

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(\prod_{k=1}^{n}a_k)^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq e\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}a_n,$$

with the constant e best possible.

There is a rich literature on many different proofs of Carleman's inequality as well as its generalizations and extensions. We shall refer the readers to the survey articles [7] and [5] as well as the references therein for an account of Carleman's inequality.

From now on we will assume $a_n \geq 0$ for $n \geq 1$ and any infinite sum converges. In [4], the author studied the following weighted Carleman's inequality:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}G_n \leq U\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}a_n, \tag{1.1}$$

where

$$G_n=\prod_{k=1}^{n}a_k^{\lambda_k/\Lambda_n}, \quad \Lambda_n=\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_k, \ \lambda_k \geq 0, \ \lambda_1>0.$$

Using Carleman's original approach in [2], the author [4] proved the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that*

$$M=\sup_n \frac{\Lambda_n}{\lambda_n}\log\Big(\frac{\Lambda_{n+1}/\lambda_{n+1}}{\Lambda_n/\lambda_n}\Big)<+\infty, \tag{1.2}$$

then inequality (1.1) *holds with* $U=e^M$.

In this paper, we consider finite sections of weighted Carleman's inequality (1.1):

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N}G_n \leq \mu_N\sum_{n=1}^{N}a_n. \tag{1.3}$$

where $N \geq 1$ is any integer. In the case of $\lambda_k=1$ (the unweighted case), De Bruijn [3] had shown that the best constant satisfies

$$\mu_N=e-\frac{2\pi^2e}{(\log N)^2}+O\Big(\frac{1}{(\log N)^3}\Big).$$

Date: June 30, 2007.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 26D15.

Key words and phrases. Carleman's inequality.

It is our goal in this paper to obtain similar asymptotic expressions for μ_N for the weighted Carleman's inequality following De Bruijn's approach in [3]. We shall prove the following

Theorem 1.2. *Assume* (1.2) *holds with* $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ *a non-decreasing sequence satisfying*

$$\sup_k \frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k} < +\infty, \tag{1.4}$$

$$M+\log(\lambda_k/\lambda_{k+1}) \leq \frac{\Lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\log\Big(\frac{\Lambda_{k+1}/\lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k/\lambda_k}\Big), \tag{1.5}$$

$$\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k}\log\Big(\frac{\Lambda_{k+1}/\lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k/\lambda_k}\Big) = M+O\Big(\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}\Big), \tag{1.6}$$

$$\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k} = \frac{C}{k}+O(\frac{1}{k^2}), \quad C>0, \tag{1.7}$$

$$\inf_k \Big(\frac{\Lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_{k+1}}-\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k}\Big) > 0. \tag{1.8}$$

Then for any integer $N \geq 1$, *inequality* (1.3) *holds with the best constant satisfying:*

$$\mu_N = e^M - \frac{2\pi^2 e^M}{C^2(\log N)^2} + O\Big(\frac{1}{(\log N)^3}\Big).$$

We note here that (1.8) implies $M>0$, which we shall use without further mentioning throughout the paper. We may also assume $N \geq 2$ from now on.

2. PRELIMINARY TREATMENT

It is our goal in this section to give an upper bound for the number U_N appearing in (1.3). We first recall the author's approach in [4] (following that of Carleman in [2]) for determining the maximum value μ_N of $\sum_{n=1}^N G_n$ in (1.3) subject to the constraint $\sum_{n=1}^N a_n = 1$ using Lagrange multipliers. It is easy to see that we may assume $a_n > 0$ for all $1 \leq n \leq N$ when the maximum is reached. We now define

$$F(\mathbf{a};\mu) = \sum_{n=1}^N G_n - \mu(\sum_{n=1}^N a_n - 1),$$

where $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{1\leq n\leq N}$. By the Lagrange method, we have to solve $\nabla F = 0$, or the following system of equations:

$$\mu a_k = \sum_{n=k}^N \frac{\lambda_k G_n}{\Lambda_n}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N; \quad \sum_{n=1}^N a_n = 1. \tag{2.1}$$

We note that on summing over $1 \leq k \leq N$ of the first N equations above, we get

$$\sum_{n=1}^N G_n = \mu.$$

Hence we have $\mu = \mu_N$ in this case which allows us to recast the equations (2.1) as:

$$\mu_N \frac{a_k}{\lambda_k} = \sum_{n=k}^N \frac{G_n}{\Lambda_n}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N; \quad \sum_{n=1}^N a_n = 1.$$

On subtracting consecutive equations, we can rewrite the above system of equations as:

$$\mu_N(\frac{a_k}{\lambda_k} - \frac{a_{k+1}}{\lambda_{k+1}}) = \frac{G_k}{\Lambda_k}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N-1; \quad \mu_N \frac{a_N}{\lambda_N} = \frac{G_N}{\Lambda_N}; \quad \sum_{n=1}^N a_n = 1.$$

Now following the notations in [3], we define for $1 \leq k \leq N-1$ (this is different from the treatment in [4]),

$$h_k = \log \frac{G_k}{a_k},$$

so that we can obtain a recursion expressing h_{k+1} in terms of h_k as follows:

$$h_{k+1} = \frac{\Lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} h_k - \frac{\Lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} \log\Big(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k} - \frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k \mu_N} e^{h_k}\Big), \quad 1 \leq k \leq N-1.$$

We now define a sequence of real functions $h_k(\mu)$ inductively by setting $h_1(\mu) = 0$ and

$$h_{k+1}(\mu) = \frac{\Lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} h_k(\mu) - \frac{\Lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} \log\Big(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k} - \frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k \mu} e^{h_k(\mu)}\Big), \quad 1 \leq k \leq N-1. \tag{2.2}$$

We note that $h_k(\mu_N) = h_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq N-1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} h_N(\mu_N) &= \frac{\Lambda_{N-1}}{\Lambda_N} h_{N-1}(\mu_N) - \frac{\Lambda_{N-1}}{\Lambda_N} \log\Big(\frac{\lambda_N}{\lambda_{N-1}} - \frac{\lambda_N}{\Lambda_{N-1}\mu_N} e^{h_{N-1}(\mu_N)}\Big) \\ &= \frac{\Lambda_{N-1}}{\Lambda_N} \log\Big(\frac{G_{N-1}}{a_{N-1}}\Big) \\ &\quad - \frac{\Lambda_{N-1}}{\Lambda_N} \log\Big(\frac{\lambda_N}{\lambda_{N-1}} - \frac{\lambda_N}{\Lambda_{N-1}\mu_N}\Big(\mu_N\Big(\frac{\Lambda_{N-1}}{\lambda_{N-1}} - \frac{\Lambda_{N-1}}{\lambda_N}\frac{a_N}{a_{N-1}}\Big)\Big)\Big) \\ &= \frac{\Lambda_{N-1}}{\Lambda_N} \log\Big(\frac{G_{N-1}}{a_N}\Big) = \log\Big(\frac{G_N}{a_N}\Big) = \log(\frac{\mu_N \Lambda_N}{\lambda_N}). \end{aligned}$$

We now show by induction that if $\mu \geq e^M$, then for any $2 \leq k \leq N$,

$$h_k(\mu) \leq M \frac{\Lambda_{k-1}}{\Lambda_k}. \tag{2.3}$$

As we have seen above that $h_N(\mu_N) = \log(\mu_N \Lambda_N/\lambda_N) \geq \log \mu_N \geq M$ when $\mu_n \geq e^M$, this forces $\mu_N < e^M$.

Now, to establish (2.3), we first consider the case $k = 2$. As $h_1 = 0$, We have by (2.2),

$$h_2(\mu) = -\frac{\Lambda_1}{\Lambda_2} \log\Big(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} - \frac{\lambda_2}{\Lambda_1 \mu}\Big). \tag{2.4}$$

It is easy to see that $h_1(\mu) \leq M\Lambda_1/\Lambda_2$ is equivalent to

$$\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} e^M \geq \frac{\lambda_2}{\Lambda_1} \frac{e^M}{\mu} + 1.$$

As $e^M/\mu \leq 1$, the above inequality follows easily from the assumption (1.2). Now assume inequality (2.3) holds for $k \geq 2$, then by (2.2) again, it is easy to see that for (2.3) to hold for $k+1$, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k} e^{M\lambda_k/\Lambda_k} \geq \frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k} \frac{e^M}{\mu} + 1,$$

and this again follows easily from the assumption (1.2).

3. The Breakdown Index

As in [3], we now try to evaluate $h_k(\mu)$ consecutively from (2.2) for any $\mu > 0$, starting with $h_1 = 0$. Certainly we are only interested in the real values of h_k and hence we say that the procedure breaks down at the first k where $\lambda_{k+1}/\lambda_k - \lambda_{k+1}/(\Lambda_k \mu) e^{h_k(\mu)} \leq 0$, or equivalently,

$$h_k(\mu) \geq \log(\mu \Lambda_k/\lambda_k). \tag{3.1}$$

We define the breakdown index N_μ as the smallest k for which inequality (3.1) holds if there is such a k and we put $N_\mu = +\infty$ otherwise. Thus for all $\mu > 0$ we can say that $h_k(\mu)$ is defined for all $k \leq N_\mu$.

Note that (2.3) implies $N_\mu = +\infty$ when $\mu \geq e^M$. So from now on we may assume $0 < \mu < e^M$ and it is convenient to have some monotonicity properties available in this case. We have $h_1(\mu) = 0$ for $0 < \mu < e^M$ and we let μ_1 be the largest μ for which inequality (3.1) holds for $k = 1$, this implies $\mu_1 = 1$. Now $h_2(\mu)$ is defined for $\mu > \mu_1$, and $h_2(\mu)$ is given by (2.4), which is a decreasing function of μ for $\mu > \mu_1$. Note also that the right-hand side expression of inequality (3.1) is an increasing function of μ for any fixed k. It follows that

$$\lim_{\mu \to \mu_1^+} h_2(\mu) = +\infty; \quad h_2(e^M) \leq M(1 - \lambda_2/\Lambda_2) < \log(e^M \Lambda_2/\lambda_2) \leq \log(\mu \Lambda_2/\lambda_2).$$

Thus there is exactly one value of $\mu < e^M$ for which inequality (3.1) holds with equality for $k = 2$ and we define this value of μ to be μ_2. This procedure can be continued. At each step we argue that $h_k(\mu)$ is defined and decreasing for $\mu > \mu_{k-1}$, that

$$\lim_{\mu \to \mu_{k-1}^+} h_k(\mu) = +\infty; \quad h_k(e^M) \leq M(1 - \lambda_k/\Lambda_k) < \log(e^M \Lambda_k/\lambda_k) \leq \log(\mu \Lambda_k/\lambda_k).$$

We then infer that μ_k is uniquely determined by $h_k(\mu) = \log(\mu\Lambda_k/\lambda_k)$. Moreover, $h_{k+1}(\mu)$ is again defined and decreasing for $\mu > \mu_k$ as both terms on the right of (2.2) are decreasing functions of μ.

Thus by induction we obtain that

$$1 = \mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < \ldots < e^M, \tag{3.2}$$

and that $h_{k+1}(\mu)$ is defined and decreasing for $\mu > \mu_k$. Moreover, $h_k(\mu) > \log(\mu\Lambda_k/\lambda_k)$ if $\mu_{k-1} < \mu < \mu_k$, $h_k(\mu_k) = \log(\mu_k\Lambda_k/\lambda_k)$, $h_k(\mu) < \log(\mu_k\Lambda_k/\lambda_k)$ if $\mu > \mu_k$.

It follows that the breakdown index N_μ equals 1 if $\mu \leq \mu_1$, 2 if $\mu_1 < \mu \leq \mu_2$, etc. We remark here that for fixed $\mu \leq e^M$, the $h_k(\mu)$'s are non-negative and increase as k increases from 1 to N_k. This follows from (2.2) by noting that

$$h_{k+1}(\mu) - h_k(\mu) = -\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} h_k(\mu) - \frac{\Lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} \log\Big(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k} - \frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k \mu} e^{h_k(\mu)}\Big). \tag{3.3}$$

It thus suffices to show the right-hand side expression above is non-negative. Equivalently, this is $\lambda_{k+1}/\lambda_k \leq f(h_k(\mu))$, where

$$f(x) = \frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k \mu} e^x + e^{-\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k} x}.$$

It is easy to see that $f(x)$ is minimized at $x_0 = \Lambda_k/\Lambda_{k+1} \log(\lambda_k \mu/\lambda_{k+1})$. Note also that

$$\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k \mu} e^{x_0} = \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k} e^{-\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k} x_0}.$$

It follows that

$$f(x) \geq f(x_0) = \frac{\Lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k} e^{-\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k} x_0}.$$

It follows from (1.5) that

$$\log(\lambda_k e^M/\lambda_{k+1}) = M + \log(\lambda_k/\lambda_{k+1}) \leq \frac{\Lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k} \log\Big(\frac{\Lambda_{k+1}/\lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k/\lambda_k}\Big).$$

It is easy to see that the above inequality implies that $f(x_0) \geq \lambda_{k+1}/\lambda_k$ so that the $h_k(\mu)$'s increase as k increases from 1 to N_k.

The breakdown condition (3.1) is slightly awkward. We now replace it by a simpler one, for example, $h_k > \max(2, 2M)$, by virtue of the following argument. Let $0 < \mu < e^M$ and assume that N is such that $h_N > \max(2, 2M)$. Note that (1.7) implies that $\lim_{k \to +\infty} \Lambda_k/\lambda_k = +\infty$ so that the right-hand side expression of (3.1) approaches $+\infty$ as k tends to $+\infty$. Hence we may assume $N_\mu \geq N$ without loss of generality. Then we have

$$\log N_\mu - \log N = O(1).$$

For, if $N \leq k \leq N_\mu$, the right-hand side of (3.3) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} h_k(\mu) - \frac{\Lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} \log\Big(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\Big) - \frac{\Lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} \log\Big(1 - \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k \mu} e^{h_k(\mu)}\Big) \\ = & -\frac{\Lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} \log\Big(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\Big) + \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big(\frac{e^{h_k(\mu)}}{\mu} - h_k(\mu)\Big) + \frac{\Lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} \sum_{i=2}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{i}\Big(\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k} \frac{e^{h_k(\mu)}}{\mu}\Big)^i \\ \geq & \ \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big(\frac{e^{h_k(\mu)}}{\mu} - h_k(\mu) - \frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k} \log\Big(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\Big)\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Note that, in view of (1.2) and (1.6),

$$\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k} \log\Big(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\Big) = -\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k} \log\Big(\frac{\Lambda_{k+1}/\lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k/\lambda_k}\Big) + \frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k} \log\Big(\frac{\Lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k}\Big) = 1 - M + O\Big(\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}\Big). \tag{3.5}$$

As $(e^{h-M} - h + M - 1)h^{-2}$ increases for $h \geq \max(2, 2M)$, we conclude that there exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ and an integer N_0 independent of μ such that for $k \geq N_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{k+1}(\mu) - h_k(\mu) & \geq \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big(e^{h_k(\mu)-M} - h_k(\mu) + M - 1\Big) + O\Big(\frac{\lambda_k^2}{\Lambda_k \Lambda_{k+1}}\Big) \\ & > \frac{C_0 \lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} h_k^2(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

We may assume $N \geq N_0$ from now on without loss of generality and we now simply the above relations by defining $d_N, d_{N+1}, \ldots$, starting with $d_N = h_N$, and

$$d_{k+1} - d_k = \frac{C_0 \lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} d_k^2. \tag{3.6}$$

Obviously we have $d_k \leq h_k \leq \log(\mu \Lambda_k/\lambda_k)$ for $N \leq k \leq N_\mu$. We use the bound

$$\log(\mu \Lambda_k/\lambda_k) \leq M + \log(\Lambda_k/\lambda_k) \leq M - 1 + \Lambda_k/\lambda_k \leq M \Lambda_k/\lambda_k.$$

to get that $d_k \leq M\Lambda_k/\lambda_k$ for $N \leq k \leq N_\mu$. It follows from (3.6) that

$$d_{k+1} - d_k \leq C_0 M d_k.$$

The above implies that we have $d_{k+1} \leq (C_0 M + 1) d_k$ for $N \leq k \leq N_\mu$ and (3.6) further implies that

$$d_{k+1} - d_k \geq \frac{C_0 \lambda_k}{(C_0 M + 1)\Lambda_{k+1}} d_k d_{k+1}. \tag{3.7}$$

We now apply (1.7) to obtain via (3.7) that there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ and an integer N_1 independent of μ such that for $k \geq N_1$,

$$d_k^{-1} - d_{k+1}^{-1} \geq \frac{C_1}{k+1}.$$

Certainly we may assume $N \geq N_1$ as well. Summing the above for $N \leq k \leq N_\mu - 1$ yields:

$$\frac{1}{\max(2, 2M)} \geq d_N^{-1} \geq \sum_{N \leq k \leq N_\mu - 1} \frac{C_1}{k+1}.$$

It follows from this that

$$\log N_\mu - \log N = -\sum_{N \leq k \leq N_\mu - 1} \log\Big(\frac{k}{k+1}\Big) \leq \sum_{N \leq k \leq N_\mu - 1} \frac{1}{k+1} + O(1) = O(1). \tag{3.8}$$

We shall see in what follows that the relation (3.8) implies that there is no harm studying $\log N$ in stead of $\log N_\mu$. So from now on we shall concentrate on finding the smallest k such that $h_k(\mu) > \max(2, 2M)$.

4. HEURISTIC TREATMENT

Our problem is, roughly, to determine how many steps we have to take in our recurrence (3.3) in order to push h_k beyond the value of $\max(2, 2M)$, assuming that μ is fixed, $\mu < e^M$ and μ close to e^M. Now assume we are able to neglect all the other terms of the right-hand side expression in (3.4) other than the first two terms, then we have a recurrence which can be written as

$$\Delta h = \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big(\frac{e^{h_k(\mu)}}{\mu} - h_k(\mu) - \frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k}\log\Big(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\Big)\Big).$$

In view of (3.5), we may replace the last term above by $1 - M$ and we may further consider the following recurrence using (1.7):

$$\Delta h = \frac{C}{k+1}\Big(\frac{e^{h_k(\mu)}}{\mu} - h_k(\mu) + M - 1\Big).$$

Next we consider k as a continuous variable, and we replace the above by the corresponding differential equation, that is, we replace Δh by dh/dk. Then we get

$$\frac{d\log(k+1)}{dh} = C^{-1}\Big(\mu^{-1}e^h - h + M - 1\Big)^{-1}.$$

This suggests that if N is the number of steps necessary to increase h from 0 to about $\max(2, 2M)$, then $\log N$ is roughly equal to

$$\frac{1}{C}\int_0^{\max(2,2M)} \frac{dh}{\mu^{-1}e^h - h + M - 1}. \tag{4.1}$$

The integrand has its maximum at $h = \log\mu$, and this is close to M. In the neighborhood of that maximum it can be approximated by

$$\frac{1}{2}(h - \log\mu)^2 + M - \log\mu.$$

Therefore the value of (4.1) can be compared with

$$\frac{1}{C}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{dh}{\frac{1}{2}(h-\log\mu)^2 + M - \log\mu} = \frac{\sqrt{2}\pi}{C}\Big(\log(e^M/\mu)\Big)^{-1/2}.$$

From this we see that for $\mu < e^M, \mu \to e^M$, we expect to have

$$\log N_\mu = \frac{\sqrt{2}\pi}{C}\Big(\log(e^M/\mu)\Big)^{-1/2} + O(1). \tag{4.2}$$

From this we see that if $\mu \to e^M$, then $\log N_\mu$ tends to infinity. This also implies that for the sequence $\{\mu_k\}$ defined as in (3.2), one must have $\lim_{k\to+\infty}\mu_k = e^M$. For otherwise, the sequence $\{\mu_k\}$ is bounded above by a constant $< e^M$ and on taking any μ greater than this constant (and less than e^M), then the left-hand side of (4.2) becomes infinity (by our definition of N_μ) but the right-hand side of (4.2) stays bounded, a contradiction.

Note that if $\mu = \mu_N$, then $N_\mu = N$, it follows from (4.2) that

$$\log(e^M/\mu_N) = \frac{2\pi^2}{C^2}\Big(\log N + O(1)\Big)^{-2}.$$

It is easy to see that the above leads to the following asymptotic expression for μ_N:

$$\mu_N = e^M - \frac{2\pi^2 e^M}{C^2(\log N)^2} + O\Big(\frac{1}{(\log N)^3}\Big).$$

There are various doubtful steps in our argument above, but the only one that presents a serious difficulty is the omitting of all the other terms of the right-hand side expression of (3.4). Certainly those terms can be expected to give only a small contribution if k is large but the question is whether this contribution is small compared to $\mu^{-1}e^h - h + M - 1$. The latter expression can be small if both $h_k - M$ and $\mu - e^M$ are small, and it is especially in that region that the integrand of (4.1) produces its maximal effect.

5. Lemmas

Lemma 5.1. *For any given number $\eta > 0, 0 < \epsilon < M$, one can find an integer $k_0 > \eta$ and a number β, $e^{M-1} < \beta < e^M$ such that for $\beta < \mu \leq e^M$,*

$$M - \epsilon < h_{k_0}(\mu) < \log \mu - \frac{M}{2}\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. Note first that by (2.3) and our discussions in Section 3 that the $h_k(e^M)$'s are non-negative, we have

$$0 \leq h_k(e^M) \leq M\frac{\Lambda_{k-1}}{\Lambda_k}.$$

Let k_1 be an integer so that for all $k \geq k_0$,

$$M\frac{\Lambda_{k-1}}{\Lambda_k} > M - \epsilon.$$

We may assume that $k \geq k_1$ from now on and note that not all $h_k(e^M)$ are $\leq M - \epsilon$. Otherwise, it follows from (3.3), (1.7), (3.4) and (3.5) that

$$h_{k+1}(e^M) - h_k(e^M) \geq \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big(\frac{e^{h_k(e^M)}}{e^M} - h_k(e^M) + M - 1\Big) + O(\frac{1}{k^2}).$$

Note that if $h_k(e^M) \leq M - \epsilon$ then

$$\frac{e^{h_k(e^M)}}{e^M} - h_k(e^M) + M - 1 \geq e^{M-\epsilon-M} - M + \epsilon + M - 1 > 0.$$

It follows from (1.7) and the fact that $\sum_{k=k_1}^{\infty}(k+1)^{-1} = +\infty$ that this leads to a contradiction. Thus there is an integer $k_0 > \eta$ for which

$$M - \epsilon < h_{k_0}(e^M) \leq M\frac{\Lambda_{k-1}}{\Lambda_k} < \log e^M - \frac{M}{2}\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}.$$

Having fixed k_0 this way, we remark that $h_{k_0}(\mu)$ is continuous at $\mu = e^M$ and the lemma follows. □

Lemma 5.2. *There exist numbers β, $e^{M-1} < \beta < e^M$, and $c > 0$, $0 < \delta < 1$ such that for all μ satisfying $\beta < \mu \leq e^M$, and for all k satisfying $1 \leq k \leq N_\mu$ (N_μ is the breakdown index) we have*

$$\frac{e^{h_k(\mu)}}{\mu} - h_k(\mu) + M - 1 > c\Big(\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k}\Big)^{-\delta}. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. We apply Lemma 5.1 with η large enough so that the following inequality holds for any integer $k \geq \eta$:

$$\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big| - \frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k}\log\Big(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\Big) + 1 - M\Big| + \frac{\Lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{i}\Big(\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}\Big)^i < \frac{3}{4}\frac{\lambda_k^2}{\Lambda_k\Lambda_{k+1}}. \tag{5.3}$$

We shall also choose ϵ small enough so that we obtain values of k_0 and β. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\mu < e^M$ and for the time being we keep μ fixed ($\beta < \mu < e^M$) and we write h_k instead of $h_k(\mu)$.

As we remarked in Section 3, the sequence $h_{k_0}, h_{k_0+1}, \dots$ is increasing, possibly until breakdown. We shall now first consider those integers $k \geq k_0$ for which $h_k < \log \mu$. For those k we can prove

$$h_{k+1} - h_k < \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}(\log \mu - h_k)^2 + \log(\frac{e^M}{\mu}) + \frac{3}{4}\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}\Big). \tag{5.4}$$

This follows by (3.3) and (3.4), using $e^{-u} < 1 - u + u^2/2$, where $u = \log \mu - h_\mu$ and noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big(-\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k}\log\Big(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\Big) + 1 - M\Big) + \frac{\Lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{i}\Big(\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}e^{-u}\Big)^i \\
< \ &\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big| -\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k}\log\Big(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\Big) + 1 - M\Big| + \frac{\Lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{i}\Big(\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}\Big)^i < \frac{3}{4}\frac{\lambda_k^2}{\Lambda_k\Lambda_{k+1}},
\end{aligned}$$

because of $e^{-u} < 1$ and (5.3).

Since $\mu < e^M$ and by Lemma 5.1, $M - \epsilon < h_{k_0} \leq h_k < \log \mu$, we have $0 < \log \mu - h_k < 2\epsilon$, and therefore we can replace (5.4) by the linear recurrence relation

$$h_{k+1} - h_k < \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big(\epsilon(\log \mu - h_k) + \log(\frac{e^M}{\mu}) + \frac{3}{4}\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}\Big). \tag{5.5}$$

Putting

$$\epsilon(\log \mu - h_k) + \log(\frac{e^M}{\mu}) - \frac{1}{4}\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k} = t_k, \tag{5.6}$$

so that it follows from (5.5) that

$$t_{k+1} > t_k\Big(1 - \frac{\epsilon\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big) + (\frac{\lambda_k}{4\Lambda_k} - \frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{4\Lambda_{k+1}} - \frac{\epsilon\lambda_k^2}{\Lambda_k\Lambda_{k+1}}).$$

As we have assumed that $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ a non-decreasing sequence, we have

$$\frac{\lambda_k}{4\Lambda_k} - \frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{4\Lambda_{k+1}} - \frac{\epsilon\lambda_k^2}{\Lambda_k\Lambda_{k+1}} \geq \frac{\lambda_k}{4\Lambda_k} - \frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{4\Lambda_{k+1}} - \frac{\epsilon\lambda_k\lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k\Lambda_{k+1}}.$$

It follows from (1.8) that the right-hand side expression above is positive if we choose ϵ small enough and we may assume that our $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ is so chosen. Note that this also implies that $0 < \log \mu - h_k < 2\epsilon < 1$. It follows that

$$t_{k+1} > t_k\Big(1 - \frac{\epsilon\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big) \geq t_k\Big(1 - \frac{\epsilon\lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big). \tag{5.7}$$

By Lemma 5.1 we have $t_{k_0} > 0$ so that the above implies $t_k > 0$ for all k under consideration.

It follows from (5.7) and $1 - \epsilon x > (1 - x)^\epsilon, 0 < x < 1$ that

$$t_{k+1} > t_k(\Lambda_k)^\epsilon(\Lambda_{k+1})^{-\epsilon} = t_k(\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k})^\epsilon(\frac{\Lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k})^{-\epsilon}.$$

It follows from (1.8) that the sequence $\{\Lambda_k/\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is increasing and we deduce that

$$t_{k+1} > t_{k_0}(\frac{\Lambda_{k_0}}{\lambda_{k_0}})^\epsilon(\frac{\Lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k})^{-\epsilon}, \tag{5.8}$$

for all k under consideration, i.e. for all k for which $h_k < \log \mu$. This is certainly satisfied if $t_k > \log(e^M/\mu)$, and (5.8) guarantees that this is true as long as the right-hand side expression of (5.8) is $> \log(e^M/\mu)$. Therefore

$$t_k \geq t_{k_0}(\frac{\Lambda_{k_0}}{\lambda_{k_0}})^\epsilon(\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_{k-1}})^{-\epsilon} \tag{5.9}$$

for all $k \geq k_0$ satisfying

$$\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_{k-1}} < \Big(\frac{\Lambda_{k_0}}{\lambda_{k_0}}\Big) t_{k_0}^{1/\epsilon} \Big(\log(e^M/\mu)\Big)^{-1/\epsilon}, \tag{5.10}$$

and we are sure that no breakdown occurs in this range.

Now we return to the discussion on (5.2) and if $0 < h < \log\mu$, we have, on using $e^{-u} > 1-u+u^2/3$ for $0 < u < 1$ and $0 < \log(e^M/\mu) < 1$, that

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{h-\log\mu} - h + M - 1 \\ > \; & \log(e^M/\mu) + \frac{1}{3}(\log\mu - h)^2 > \Big(\log(e^M/\mu)\Big)^2 + \frac{1}{3}(\log\mu - h)^2 \\ > \; & \frac{1}{8}\Big(2\log(e^M/\mu) + \log\mu - h\Big)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality above follows from $u^2 + v^2/3 > u^2 + (v/2)^2 \geq (u + v/2)^2/2$ for $u, v > 0$. Apply this with $h = h_k$ and note that it follows from (5.6) and (5.9) that

$$(\epsilon+1)\Big(\log\mu - h_k + 2\log(\frac{e^M}{\mu})\Big) > t_k \geq t_{k_0}(\frac{\Lambda_{k_0}}{\lambda_{k_0}})^{\epsilon}(\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_{k-1}})^{-\epsilon},$$

This implies that the left-hand side of (5.2) is at least

$$\frac{t_{k_0}^2}{8(\epsilon+1)^2}(\frac{\Lambda_{k_0}}{\lambda_{k_0}})^{2\epsilon}(\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_{k-1}})^{-2\epsilon}.$$

This holds for k when (5.10) is satisfied. It follows from (1.4) that λ_k/λ_{k-1} is bounded above for any $k \geq 2$. Let c_1 denote such an upper bound and we conclude that the left-hand side of (5.2) is at least

$$\frac{t_{k_0}^2}{8(\epsilon+1)^2 c_1^{2\epsilon}}(\frac{\Lambda_{k_0}}{\lambda_{k_0}})^{2\epsilon}(\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k})^{-2\epsilon} := c_2(\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k})^{-2\epsilon}.$$

Other k's do not cause much trouble. First, for the values $1 \leq k < k_0$, we have $h_k(\mu) \leq h_{k_0}(\mu) < \log\mu - M\lambda_{k_0}/(2\Lambda_{k_0})$ by Lemma 5.1 and the fact that h_k increases as k increases. It follows that

$$e^{h_k - \log\mu} - h_k + M - 1 > \frac{1}{3}(\log\mu - h_k)^2 > \frac{M^2\lambda_{k_0}^2}{12\Lambda_{k_0}^2} \geq \frac{M^2\lambda_{k_0}^2}{12\Lambda_{k_0}^2}(\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k})^{-2\epsilon} := c_3(\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k})^{-2\epsilon}.$$

Now, for the remaining case $k_0 \leq k \leq N_\mu$ (which is empty if $\mu = e^M$) such that

$$\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_{k-1}} \geq \Big(\frac{\Lambda_{k_0}}{\lambda_{k_0}}\Big) t_{k_0}^{1/\epsilon} \Big(\log(e^M/\mu)\Big)^{-1/\epsilon},$$

we use that

$$e^{h-\log\mu} - h + M - 1 > \log(e^M/\mu)$$

for all h to see that the left-hand side of (5.2) is at least

$$\Big(\frac{\Lambda_{k_0}}{\lambda_{k_0}}\Big)^{\epsilon}\frac{t_{k_0}}{c_1^{\epsilon}}(\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k})^{-2\epsilon} := c_4(\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k})^{-2\epsilon}.$$

In all three cases the constants are independent of μ and k, so on letting $c = \min(c_2, c_3, c_4)$ and $\delta = 2\epsilon$ completes the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 5.3. *There exist numbers β, $e^{M-1} < \beta < e^M$ such that for all μ satisfying $\beta < \mu < e^M$ there exists an index $N < N_\mu$ with $h_N > \max(2, 2M)$.*

Proof. We apply Lemma 5.1 with η large enough and some $0 < \epsilon < 1$, so that the following estimation holds for any integer $k \geq \eta$:

$$\lambda_k/\Lambda_k < e^{-2-\max(2,2M)}/2, \quad \Big| -\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k}\log\Big(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\Big) + 1 - M\Big| < 1 - \log 2, \tag{5.11}$$

and Lemma 5.1 provides us with $k_0 > \eta$ and β such that (5.1) holds. We now consider the numbers $h_{k_0}, h_{k_0+1}, \dots$ as far as they are $< \max(2,2M) + M + 1$. If $k \geq k_0$, $h_k < \max(2,2M) + M + 1$, we have

$$\mu^{-1}\lambda_k/\Lambda_k e^{h_k} \leq 1/2, \tag{5.12}$$

so that by our definition of the breakdown index (see (3.1)), we have $k < N_\mu$. It also follows from (3.3)-(3.5), on using $e^h/\mu - h + M - 1 > \log(e^M/\mu)$, that

$$h_{k+1} - h_k > \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\log(e^M/\mu) + O(\frac{\lambda_k^2}{\Lambda_k\Lambda_{k+1}}).$$

The lower bound above shows that not for all $k \geq k_0$ we have $h_k \leq \max(2,2M)$, since $\sum_{k_0}^{+\infty}(h_{k+1} - h_k)$ would diverge in view of (1.7).

Now, (5.12), implies that (with $u = \log\mu - h_\mu$ here)

$$\frac{\Lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{i}\Big(\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}e^{-u}\Big)^i \leq \sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{i}(\frac{1}{2})^i = \log 2 - 1/2.$$

It follows from this and (3.3), (3.4), (5.11), (5.12) that

$$h_{k+1} - h_k < \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}(\frac{e^{h_k}}{\mu} - \mu + M - 1) + 1 - \log 2 + \log 2 - 1/2.$$

When $M \leq 1$, the above can be estimated by, via (5.11),

$$h_{k+1} - h_k < \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}\frac{e^{h_k}}{\mu} + 1/2 < 1 < M + 1.$$

Similarly, when $M > 1$, we get

$$h_{k+1} - h_k < \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}\frac{e^{h_k}}{\mu} + M - 1 + 1/2 < M + 1.$$

It follows from the above that if we let h_{k_1} be the last one below $\max(2,2M)$, then h_{k_1+1} is still below $\max(2,2M) + M + 1$ so that we can take $N = k_1 + 1$ here and this completes the proof. □

6. Proof of Theorem 1.2

As suggested by the discussion in Section 4, we shall study $\theta(h_k)$, where θ is defined by

$$\theta(y) = \int_0^y \frac{dx}{e^x/\mu - x + M - 1}.$$

We first simplify the recurrence formula (3.3). Assuming

$$e^{M-1} < \mu \leq e^M, \quad h_k < \max(2,2M), \tag{6.1}$$

we may also assume k is large enough so that (3.1) is not satisfied. We have

$$h_{k+1} - h_k = \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}\Big(\frac{e^{h_k}}{\mu} - h_k + M - 1 + \gamma_k\Big),$$

where

$$|\gamma_k| \leq \Big| -\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k}\log\Big(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\Big) - M + 1\Big| + \frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k}\sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{i}\Big(\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}e^{h_\mu - \log\mu}\Big)^i \leq C_2\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k},$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$. It follows from this that there exists a constant $C_3 > 0$ such that

$$|h_{k+1} - h_k| \leq C_3 \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}}.$$

We then deduce easily from above that for $h_k \leq x \leq h_{k+1}$,

$$\Big|\frac{e^x}{\mu} - x - (\frac{e^{h_k}}{\mu} - h_k)\Big| \leq C_4 \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} \leq C_4 \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k},$$

where $C_4 > 0$ is a constant not depending on μ or k (still assuming (6.1)).

We now apply the mean value theorem to get:

$$\theta(h_{k+1}) - \theta(h_k) = (h_{k+1} - h_k)\theta'(x)$$

with some x in between h_k and h_{k+1}. Hence it follows from our discussion above that

$$\theta(h_{k+1}) - \theta(h_k) = \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} \frac{H + \gamma_k}{H + \gamma'_k},$$

where

$$H = \frac{e^{h_k}}{\mu} - h_k + M - 1, \quad |\gamma_k| \leq C_2 \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}, \quad |\gamma'_k| \leq C_4 \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}.$$

We now apply Lemma 5.2 to conclude that there exists a β_1 with $e^{M-1} < \beta_1 < e^M$ and a $c > 0$, $0 < \delta < 1$ such that for all k satisfying $1 \leq k \leq N_\mu$, we have

$$H > c\Big(\frac{\Lambda_k}{\lambda_k}\Big)^{-\delta}.$$

This implies that

$$|\gamma_k| \leq \frac{C_2}{c}\Big(\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}\Big)^{1-\delta} H, \quad |\gamma'_k| \leq \frac{C_4}{c}\Big(\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k}\Big)^{1-\delta} H.$$

Note it follows from (1.7) that

$$\frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}} - \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k} = -\frac{\lambda_k \lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k \Lambda_{k+1}} = O(\frac{1}{k^2}).$$

It follows from this and (1.7) that we can find an integer m, independent of μ such that for $k > m, h_k < \max(2, 2M)$, we have

$$\theta(h_{k+1}) - \theta(h_k) = \frac{\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k} \frac{H + \gamma_k}{H + \gamma'_k} + O(\frac{1}{k^2}) = \frac{C}{k} + O\Big(\frac{1}{k^2} + \frac{1}{k^{2-\delta}}\Big).$$

We recast the above as

$$|\theta(h_{k+1}) - \theta(h_k) - C\log(1 + 1/k)| = O\Big(\frac{1}{k^2} + \frac{1}{k^{2-\delta}}\Big).$$

Now assuming $\mu < e^M$, we take the sum over the values $m \leq k < N$, where N is the first index with $h_N > \max(2, 2M)$ (see Lemma 5.3). This gives us

$$|\theta(h_N) - C\log N| = O(1) + \log m + \theta(h_m).$$

By Lemma 5.1, for any $\eta > M$, there exists $\beta_2, \beta_1 < \beta_2 < e^M$ and $k_0 > \eta$ so that $h_{k_0}(\mu) < \log\mu - M\lambda_{k_0}/(2\Lambda_{k_0})$. We now further take the integer m to be equal to this k_0. Thus, the maximum of the integrand in $\theta(h_m)$ is attained at $x = h_m$ and that

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{h_m}/\mu - h_m + M - 1 \\
\geq \;& e^{-M\lambda_m/(2\Lambda_m)} - \log\mu + M\lambda_m/(2\Lambda_m) + M - 1 \\
> \;& 1 - M\lambda_m/(2\Lambda_m) + M^2\lambda_m^2/(8\Lambda_m^2) - \log\mu + M\lambda_m/(2\Lambda_m) + M - 1 \\
= \;& M - \log\mu + M^2\lambda_m^2/(8\Lambda_m^2) > M^2\lambda_m^2/(8\Lambda_m^2).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\theta(h_m) = \int_0^{h_m} \frac{dx}{e^x/\mu - x + M - 1} < (\log \mu)(8\Lambda_m^2)/(M^2\lambda_m^2) = O(1).$$

We deduce from this that

$$|\theta(h_N) - C\log N| = O(1). \tag{6.2}$$

It is not difficult to find the asymptotic behavior of $\theta(\infty)$. If $\mu < e^M$, $\mu \to e^M$, then routine methods (cf. Sec. 4) lead to

$$\theta(\infty) = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dx}{e^x/\mu - x + M - 1} = \sqrt{2}\pi\Big(\log(e^M/\mu)\Big)^{-1/2} + O(1).$$

It is also easy to see that $\theta(\infty) - \theta(\max(2, 2M)) = O(1)$. As $h_N \geq \max(2, 2M)$, we have $\theta(\max(2, 2M)) \leq \theta(h_N) < \theta(\infty)$. It follows from (6.2) that

$$\log N = \frac{\sqrt{2}\pi}{C}\Big(\log(e^M/\mu)\Big)^{-1/2} + O(1).$$

According to (3.8) and our discussion in Section 4, this completes the proof of (4.2) and it was already shown there that (4.2) leads to our assertion for Theorem 1.2.

7. An Application of Theorem 1.2

As an application of Theorem 1.2, we consider in this section the case $\lambda_k = k^\alpha$ for $\alpha \geq 1$. Certainly, the sequence $\{k^\alpha\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a non-decreasing sequence satisfying (1.4). We note the following

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\alpha \geq 1$ be fixed. For any integer $n \geq 1$, we have*

$$\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}\frac{n^\alpha(n+1)^\alpha}{(n+1)^\alpha - n^\alpha} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n i^\alpha \leq \frac{(n+1)^{\alpha+1}}{\alpha+1}. \tag{7.1}$$

We point out here the left-hand side inequality above is [6, Lemma 2, p.18] and the right-hand side inequality can be easily shown by induction.

It follows readily from the above lemma that (1.7) holds with $C = \alpha + 1$. We note here it is easy to see that (1.2) with $M = 1/C$ follows from the left-hand side inequality of (7.1), which implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} i^\alpha/(n+1)^\alpha - \sum_{i=1}^n i^\alpha/n^\alpha = 1 + \Big(\frac{1}{(n+1)^\alpha} - \frac{1}{n^\alpha}\Big)\sum_{i=1}^n i^\alpha \leq \frac{1}{\alpha+1}.$$

This combined with the upper bound in (7.1) also leads to (1.6) easily.

Now, to show (1.5), we assume (1.8) for the moment and note that

$$\log\Big(\frac{\Lambda_{k+1}/\lambda_{k+1}}{\Lambda_k/\lambda_k}\Big) = \log\Big(1 + \frac{\Lambda_{k+1}/\lambda_{k+1} - \Lambda_k/\lambda_k}{\Lambda_k/\lambda_k}\Big) \geq \frac{\Lambda_{k+1}/\lambda_{k+1} - \Lambda_k/\lambda_k}{\Lambda_{k+1}/\lambda_{k+1}}.$$

We then deduce that (1.5) follows from

$$\Lambda_{k+1}/\lambda_{k+1} - \Lambda_k/\lambda_k \geq M\lambda_k/\lambda_{k+1}.$$

Note that the above also establishes (1.8). In our case, it is easy to see that this becomes (for any $n \geq 1$):

$$\sum_{i=1}^n i^\alpha \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}\frac{(n+1)^{2\alpha}}{(n+2)^\alpha - (n+1)^\alpha}. \tag{7.2}$$

To show this, we define

$$P_n(\alpha) = \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n i^\alpha \Big/ \frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} i^\alpha\right)^{1/\alpha}.$$

We recall that Bennett [1] proved that for $\alpha \geq 1$,

$$P_n(\alpha) \leq P_n(1) = \frac{n+1}{n+2}.$$

It is easy to see that this is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} i^\alpha \leq \frac{n(n+1)^{2\alpha}}{(n+1)(n+2)^\alpha - n(n+1)^\alpha}.$$

Thus, in order to prove (7.2), it suffices to prove the following

$$\frac{n(n+1)^{2\alpha}}{(n+1)(n+2)^\alpha - n(n+1)^\alpha} \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1} \frac{(n+1)^{2\alpha}}{(n+2)^\alpha - (n+1)^\alpha}.$$

The above inequality can be seen easily to be equivalent to the following

$$n\Big((n+2)^\alpha - (n+1)^\alpha\Big) \leq \alpha(n+2)^\alpha,$$

which follows easily from the mean value theorem. Thus, we have shown, as a consequence of Theorem (1.2) the following

Corollary 7.1. *Fix $\alpha \geq 1$ and let $\lambda_k = k^\alpha$ for $k \geq 1$. Then inequality* (1.3) *holds with*

$$U_N = e^{1/(\alpha+1)} - \frac{2\pi^2 e^{1/(\alpha+1)}}{(\alpha+1)^2(\log N)^2} + O\Big(\frac{1}{(\log N)^3}\Big).$$

References

[1] G. Bennett, Lower bounds for matrices. II., *Canad. J. Math.*, **44** (1992), 54-74.

[2] T. Carleman, Sur les fonctions quasi-analytiques, in *Proc. 5th Scand. Math. Congress*, Helsingfors, Finland, 1923, pp. 181–196.

[3] N. G. De Bruijn, Carleman's inequality for finite series, *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A 66 = Indag, Math.*, **25** (1963), 505–514.

[4] P. Gao, A note on Carleman's inequality, arXiv:0706.2368.

[5] J. Duncan and C. M. McGregor, Carleman's inequality, *Amer. Math. Monthly*, **110** (2003), 424–431.

[6] V. I. Levin and S.B. Stečkin, Inequalities, *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. (2)*, **14** (1960), 1–29.

[7] J. Pečarić and K. Stolarsky, Carleman's inequality: history and new generalizations, *Aequationes Math.*, **61** (2001), 49–62.

Department of Computer and Mathematical Sciences, University of Toronto at Scarborough, 1265 Military Trail, Toronto Ontario, Canada M1C 1A4

E-mail address: `penggao@utsc.utoronto.ca`